UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,908	04/08/2005	Stefan Ossenkopp	3261	9897

7590 07/09/2008

Striker Striker & Stenby
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, NY 11743

EXAMINER	
CAZAN, LIVIUS RADU	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3729	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/530,908	OSSENKOPP ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LIVIUS R. CAZAN	3729	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 April 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/2/2008*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/17/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claims 1-11 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. **Regarding claim 1**, in step b), the phrase "loading offsetting dies with stamped wire elements" renders the claim indefinite, because, as currently recited, it is unclear whether these stamped wire elements are some or all of the wire elements stamped in step a). As currently claimed, these stamped wire elements could be different and do not necessarily have a profile stamped to increase a slot space factor. The phrase "and rotating said stamped wire elements counter to one another in a circumferential direction" renders the claim indefinite, because, as currently claimed it is unclear what exactly is being done. It would appear stamped wire elements are inserted into dies,

and thereafter, stamped wire elements are rotated in place in opposite directions. It is unclear what the role of the dies is during this process. Moreover, the recited circumferential direction cannot be identified, as the claim does not specify any relationship between this direction and the structural elements. Likewise, the phrase "so that the stamped wire elements are disposed at right angles to one another and radially inward" renders the claim indefinite, since it is not clear what is being done. The fact that the stamped wire elements are at right angles to each other would suggest that, given two stamped wire elements, they are disposed such that the longitudinal direction of one is perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the other. However, it is unclear how more than two stamped wire elements can satisfy this relationship, since, at least some of the stamped wire elements would differ from 90 degrees in the angle between them. Also, as currently claimed, the radially inward direction cannot be ascertained. Still further, step b) recites "to form an integrated star point". As discussed during the interview on 22 August 2007, the "star point" is the neutral point in a wye-connected (star-connected) winding. Therefore, no actual star point exists until one end from each phase coil is electrically connected to a corresponding end from the other phase coils. In Applicant's invention this takes place when the wire elements having the stamped cross-sectional profile are joined to the conductive ring. It is therefore unclear what is meant by the recitation in step b), since a star point has yet to be formed.

5. **Regarding step c),** the phrase "by rotating ends of the wire elements counter to one another using offsetting dies" renders the claim indefinite because, as currently claimed, it is unclear whether the "wire elements" are the "stamped wire elements" or if

they are the wire elements of step a). Moreover, it is unclear whether the recited offsetting dies are different from or the same as the offsetting dies recited in step b). As in step b), the particular direction of rotation is unclear, and it is unclear how the dies effect the rotation. The phrase "and offsetting the ends of the ... winding head is formed" renders the claim indefinite, because, as currently claimed, it is unclear what is meant by "so that the integrated star point is maintained". Moreover, the ends of the wire elements have already been offset once, and, therefore, it is unclear when the winding head is formed, since step c) has two offsetting steps. Also, as before, it is unclear whether "the wire elements" refers to the stamped wire elements of step b) or the wire elements of step a). Further, the phrase "wherein manufacture of the integrated star point takes place simultaneously in the same process step as the offsetting of the wire elements" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear during which particular offsetting process the integrated star point is formed. Moreover, the integrated star point was already formed in step b), though, as discussed above, no actual star point is deemed to have been manufactured yet since there is no mention of a ring.

6. **Regarding step d),** the phrase "inward-oriented ends of the wire elements" renders the claim indefinite, since there is no recitation in any of the previous steps of orienting ends of the wire elements in a radial and inward direction. Moreover, it is unclear if "wire elements" refers to the stamped wire elements of step b) or the wire elements of steps a) or c). Further, the phrase "wherein the entire connecting ring is disposed radially inward on an inside or a finished winding head, wherein said winding head is formed by the ends of the wire elements" renders the claim indefinite, since, as

currently claimed, the recited radially inward position cannot be ascertained. Moreover, a winding head is formed in step c), and it is therefore unclear whether the winding head of step 3 is the same or a different winding head. Still further, it is unclear whether the recited wire elements are the same as the stamped wire elements of step b), or the wire elements of steps a) and c). Still further, a wire element has two ends, and, therefore, it is not clear if the recited ends are the same as the ends of step c).

7. **Regarding claims 2 and 3**, it is unclear whether the step of stamping is performed in addition to the stamping performed in step a) of claim 1, or if it is the same stamping operation.

8. **Regarding claim 4**, it is unclear which particular offsetting dies are being referred to, i.e. those of step b) or those of step c). Also, it is unclear if the wire elements recited in the claim are the same as or different from the stamped wire elements. Further, since in claim 1 each of steps b), c), and d) refers to forming/completing the star point, the timing of the steps of claim 4 relative to steps b), c), and d) of claim 1 is unclear.

9. **Regarding claim 6**, there is no laminated core produced in step b) of claim 1.

10. **Regarding claim 7**, the term "the wire basket" lacks proper antecedent basis.

11. **Regarding claim 8**, the term "the winding" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 1 does not recite any structural association between stamped wire elements and a winding. The phrase "the contacting end of the winding" lacks proper antecedent basis.

12. **Regarding claim 9**, the term "the winding" lacks proper antecedent basis, since claim 1 does not provide any structural relationship between a winding and other elements.

13. **Regarding claim 10**, the phrase "by connecting the wire elements to a connecting ring to form the integrated star point" renders the claim indefinite, since it is unclear whether the recited connecting ring is the same as or different from the connecting ring recited in step d of claim 1. Moreover, claim 9 refers to contacting the integrated star point, whereas claim 10 refers to connecting wire elements.

14. **Regarding claim 11**, the phrase "the bent ends of the star point wires" renders the claim indefinite, since claim 1 does not recite a step of bending wires, and the phrase" the star point wires" lacks proper antecedent basis, since claim 1 refers to no such wires.

15. **Regarding claim 13**, the phrase "star point wires" lacks proper antecedent basis, as above in claim 11. Further, it is unclear what is meant by "lie on the of the winding head".

16. It should also be noted that Applicants appear to be relying on the reference numbers in parentheses to identify the particular wire elements undergoing a transformation, but this is not proper. The actual claim language must set forth distinguishing characteristics, so as to make it clear which particular type of wire element is being acted on. Currently, the terms "wire elements" and "stamped wire elements" are used to refer to wire elements 11 alone as well as to any of wire elements 7, 11, and 12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

18. **Claims 1-11 and 13, as best understood,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafer (US5508571 to Shafer, Jr.) in view of Maesoba (US6339871 to Maesoba et al.) and Oohashi (US6707211 to Oohashi et al.) as well as over Maesoba in view of Shafer and Oohashi.

19. **Given the substantial number of issues identified above in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, the scope of the claims cannot be properly ascertained. The rejection applied on 1/11/2008 is maintained, since it appears to still be applicable to the claims, as best understood. See the *Response to Arguments* below.**

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

21. Applicants argue (page 7) the electrical machine of Schafer does not have a winding head. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The axial ends of the winding of Schafer clearly constitute winding heads. If Applicants have a different interpretation of the term "winding head", then the claims should explicitly define such structure. Currently, especially in light of the numerous issues identified in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, it is not possible to ascertain the exact structure considered to be a winding head.

22. Applicants also argue the connecting ring of Schafer is disposed at an axial end of the winding, not radially within a winding head. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As currently claimed, it is not possible to ascertain the radially inward direction. Depending on which direction is considered to be radially inward, the connecting ring is certainly disposed as claimed.

23. Applicants also argue the practitioner having knowledge of the methods of Maesoba and Oohashi would not have used the teachings of Schafer because Schafer uses a different winding principle. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. One of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that the particular winding principle has no bearing on using a connecting ring to form a star point. This is because both Maesoba and Schafer are concerned with making wye-connected (star-connected) machines, and such machines need to have one end from each of the phase coils electrically connected to the corresponding end of the remaining coils. Because of this, Schafer's teaching of using a connecting ring to effect such a connection would have been applicable to a machine with a winding such as Maesoba, because in Maesoba, too, there are conductor ends that need to be connected to form a star point, and Schafer merely teaches one way to effect such a connection.

24. Applicants further argue the combination of these references constitutes impermissible hindsight because such a combination would not teach or suggest a connecting ring for an integrated star point, disposed within the inside of a winding head. The Examiner disagrees. Motivation to combine certainly exists, since one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the applicability of the method of Schafer

to the winding of Maesoba, as discussed above. Moreover, as previously discussed, the current claim language is not sufficiently clear to ascertain the position of the ring relative to the winding head.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LIVIUS R. CAZAN whose telephone number is (571)272-8032. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571)272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. Dexter Tugbang/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3729

/L. R. C./ 7/4/2008
Examiner, Art Unit 3729